

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action mailed on July 27, 2009, which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-2, 4-10, 12 and 14-21 remain in this application, where claims 3, 11 and 13 have been currently canceled without prejudice, and claims 18-21 have been currently added. Applicant reserves the right to reintroduce subject matter deleted herein at a later time during the prosecution of this application or continuing applications. Claims 1, 8, 10 and 15 are independent.

In the Office Action, claims 8, 10, 15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph for certain informalities. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. However, in the interest of advancing prosecution, claims 8, 10, and 17 have been amended for better clarity and to remove the alleged informality. Further, it is respectfully submitted that claim 15 clearly recites different acts, such as "disabling the driving" and "in a first

mode in which the pixel voltage is applied to the input to the pixel, turning on the address transistor ..." Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph for certain informalities. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. However, in the interest of advancing prosecution, claim 11 has been canceled without prejudice, and claim 10 has been amended for better conformance with the specification. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,876,345 (Akimoto) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,188,375 (Kagey) and an article entitled "Pixel-Driving Methods for Large-Sized Poly-Si AM-OLED Displays" (Yumoto). Applicants respectfully traverse and submit that claims 1-2, 4-10, 12 and 14-21, as amended, are patentable over Akimoto, Kagey and Yumoto for at least the following reasons.

Akimoto is directed to an image display capable of multilevel display and having a minimal pixel-to-pixel display characteristic variation. On page 11 of the Office Action, last paragraph, FIG 10

and column 9, line 57 to column 10, line 21 are cited to allegedly show that "height of steps in the stepped voltage waveform is greater than a voltage width of a linear operating region of the drive transistor," as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 8, 10 and 15. (Illustrative emphasis provided)

Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that the noted portions of Akimoto recite that "each of the four voltage levels of the 4-level writing signal is set at a median value between each stepped voltage level of the pixel driving voltage sweep waveform." (Emphasis added) Such a disclosure has nothing to do any linear operating region, and does not disclose or suggest that the height of steps are greater than a voltage width of a linear operating region of the drive transistor, as recited in independent claims 1, 8, 10 and 15.

Further, on page 13 of the Office Action, FIG 2 and column 2, lines 24-37 of Kagey are cited to allegedly show that the height of steps are greater than the voltage width of the linear operating region of the drive transistor. Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that the noted portions of Kagey recite responding to

small voltage changes relative a "threshold voltage where the transistors are active." (Emphasis added) As with Akimoto, Kagey also does not discuss anything to do with the linear operation region and is silent regarding the height of steps being greater than a voltage width of a linear operating region of the drive transistor, as recited in independent claims 1, 8, 10 and 15. The discussion in Kagey related to threshold voltage where the transistors are active, has nothing to do with any step height, let alone having a step height which is greater than a voltage width of a linear operating region. A transistors being active does not disclose or suggest avoiding the linear region, or having a step height which is greater than the voltage width of the linear operating region.

Even assuming, arguendo, that somehow Akimoto and Kagey disclose or suggest that the height of steps is greater than a voltage width of a linear operating region of the drive transistor, there is still no disclosure or suggestion in Akimoto and Kagey, alone or in combination, that "the pixel voltage being selected so that a voltage range of the linear operating region corresponds to voltage levels between a transition of two steps of the stepped

voltage waveform," as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 8, 10 and 15. (Illustrative emphasis provided) Further, avoiding the linear operating region of the drive transistor, as recited in independent claims 1, 10 and 15, is nowhere disclosed or suggested in Akimoto, Kagey and combination thereof.

Avoiding the linear operating region of the drive transistor by having the height of the voltage steps be greater than the voltage width of the linear operating region of the drive transistor, and selecting a pixel voltage so that the voltage range of the linear operating region corresponds to voltage levels between a transition of two steps of the stepped voltage waveform, as recited in independent claims 1, 8, 10 and 15, are nowhere disclosed or suggested in Akimoto and Kagey, alone or in combination. Yumoto is cited to allegedly show other features and does not remedy the deficiencies in Akimoto and Kagey


Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that independent claims 1, 8, 10 and 15 be allowed. In addition, it is respectfully requested that claims 2, 4-7, 9, 12, 14 and 16-21 also be allowed at least based on their dependence from independent claims 1, 8, 10

and 15 as well as their individually patentable elements.

In addition, Applicant denies any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicant reserves the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703
Attorney for Applicant(s)
October 27, 2009

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101

Please direct all inquiries and correspondence to:
Michael E. Belk, Reg. 33,357
Philips Intellectual Property & Standards
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
(914) 333-9643